



Consultation, IA <consultation@bia.gov>

Tribal Recognition

charlie aspinwall <paug07@yahoo.com>
To: consultation@bia.gov

Tue, Jun 3, 2014 at 3:34 PM

I am a resident in the State of Connecticut and I am appalled that the proposed new regulations have given the Connecticut congressional delegation what amounts to a veto power over the Federal recognition of three remaining state-recognized tribes.

These regulations would allow, in limited circumstances, a petitioner previously denied under the old regulations to re-petition under the revised rules. Circumstances are:

- If a third party participated in an IBIA or Federal Court appeal, that third party must consent to the re-petitioning.
- If third parties consent, then petitioner must prove to OHA, by a preponderance of the evidence, that either: (1) changes to the regulations warrant a reconsideration of the final determination; or (2) the wrong standard of proof was applied to the final determination.

If OHA decides re-petitioning is appropriate, petitioner enters petitioning process at the beginning (with OFA).

This is discrimination at best and corruption at worst which would irreparably taint the legitimacy of the recognition process and the agency at large. Common sense would cause any thinking person to question this inclusion. If the criteria have changed, why in GOD'S name do "third parties" have any relevancy to the new criteria?

This approach promotes consistency and transparency in resolving re-petition requests and recognizes third-party interests in adjudicated decisions

THIS is the justification? What third-party interests are there in a tribe's civil and human rights? This is a clear violation of the Constitution's 6th amendment: the accused has the right to face their accuser. I am not an attorney, but I am certain any qualified lawyer would shred this.

Raymond Moore,
Shelton, Connecticut

